for. The member submitted that if the old survey measurements were incorrect, the assessment of cardamom gardens based on those measurements would have to be revised after the completion of the present resurvey. He also represented that there was unusual delay in the completion of this resurvey and that maps were not issued even for gardens surveyed twelve months ago.

Reply.—A resurvey was necessary to find out the variations in the extent of holdings which had been brought to the notice of Government since the completion of the original survey. Orders have been already issued to complete this survey and to supply maps expeditiously.

As regards revision of assessment, individual cases, if brought to notice, will be considered and relief given if the rules or practice permits the same.

33. Necessity for the grant of copies of measurement plans from the taluk office.

Mr. M. Sivathanu Pillai (*Tovala*) said that under the existing arrangements land-owners experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining copies of measurement plans as they were not issued from the taluks.

Reply.—This is involved in the scheme referred to in subject No. 31.

34. Desirability of apportioning the cost of boundary demarcation stones between registry holders and those in whose names lands may be registered hereafter instead of from the former alone as is now done.

Mr. Kanakku Mathevan Mathevan (*Nedumangad*) said that the present practice was to realize the cost of demarcation stones from land-holders in proportion to the amount of assessment fixed upon their lands. As this was not an equitable mode of apportionment, the member requested that the whole area of the taluk should be taken into consideration for purposes of calculation and the cost incurred by Government on this account rateably divided between both registered and unregistered lands. As the latter came to be gradually registered, the amount due on account of planting demarcation stones on them might also be realized from the proprietors concerned.

Reply.—There is, no doubt, some hardship and the apportionment does not seem to be equitable. I do not see why the cost should not

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

be apportioned in the manner suggested. It may be recovered in the first instance from actual holders of registered lands and the remainder reserved to be collected from future registry-holders as they come in. What practical difficulties there may be in this arrangement it is not possible to see now. The question will be considered.

35. That either elaborate registration enquiries should be conducted or that the orders passed on summary enquiry by the Settlement department should not be considered as revenue decisions for the purposes of the Limitation Regulation.

Mr. Agasti Agasti (*Todupuzha*) suggested that either of the above prayers might be granted as under the present rules there was much room for reasonable complaint from the ryots.

Reply.—The first suggestion is opposed to the sense of the Assembly at the last session as to the mode of registration enquiries conducted according to the new scheme of settlement.

As regards the alternative prayer, there is evidently a misapprehension as to limitation, as the suits will be by one party against another to establish title and not against the Government to set aside an order.

36. Desirability of conducting the classification of properties in the presence of and in consultation with the owners and thadasters and the grant of sufficient time for preferring appeals.

Mr. Narayanan Madhavan Karthavu (Shertallay) said that the Settlement department now conducted classification work behind the back of the parties concerned and it would be desirable to introduce a rule enjoining that this should be done only in the presence of and in consultation with the proprietors and neighbouring ryots. He also requested that the time for preferring objection-petitions might be extended to 3 months as was the case before the introduction of the new scheme.

Mr. Varkey Oothuppu (Ettumanur) spoke in support.

Mr. Aiyappan Pillai (*Vaikam*) prayed for at least one month's time being allowed for presenting objection-petitions on rough pattahs, as nothing could be done within a week, which was the time now prescribed.

Reply.—Though there is no express rule on the subject, the restriction complained of has been practically removed. There is already a provision for the Additional Assistants hearing objections

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly